

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Applicati n N .	Applicant(s)	
	10/021,475	KISH, RANDY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mathieu D. Vargot	1732	

All Participants:

(1) Mathieu D. Vargot.

(2) Mr. Hicks (Atty).

Status of Application: Under Final Rejection

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5 January 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

That of record

Claims discussed:

1-13 and 17

Prior art documents discussed:

Rohde et al

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

M. Vargot

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed the case and aspects of possible amendments to the claims. However, upon closer review, it is submitted that support for the instant method being any different than that employed in Rohde et al as pertaining to cutting through a data layer simply does not exist at the present time and hence the claims must stand as rejected thereover. .